

MINUTES OF THE CITY COUNCIL

CITY OF AUSTIN, TEXAS

Regular Meeting

April 11, 1974
1:00 P.M.Electric Auditorium
301 West Avenue

The meeting was called to order with Mayor Butler presiding.

Roll Call:

Present: Councilmen Binder, Dryden, Friedman, Handcox, Lebermann,
Mayor Butler, Mayor Pro Tem Love

Absent: None

The Invocation was delivered by REVEREND WALTER ALLEN, Central Christian Church.

PITCH IN FOR AUSTIN MONTH

Mayor Pro Tem Love read and then presented a proclamation to the following representatives of the Pitch In for Austin Committee proclaiming April 15 through May 17, 1974, as "Pitch In for Austin Month."

Mr. Dick Jordan - Coordinator
Mr. Les Gage

Mr. Van DeCamp
Mr. Harry Berry

He urged all citizens to help preserve Austin's scenic beauty by joining in the endeavor to rid Austin of litter and turn the community into the "cleanest city in America." Mr. Jordan accepted the proclamation on behalf of the Committee, and car litter bags were distributed to the Council members.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Councilman Lebermann moved that the Council approve the Regular Meeting Minutes of April 4, 1974. The motion, seconded by Councilman Dryden, carried by the following vote:

Ayes: Mayor Butler, Mayor Pro Tem Love, Councilmen Binder, Dryden
Friedman, Handcox, Lebermann

Noes: None

HEARING ON THE "WILDING" DEVELOPMENT

Mayor Butler opened the public hearing scheduled for 1:00 p.m. (postponed from April 4, 1974) to consider the following:

1. Authorization of the creation of Travis County Fresh Water Supply District No. 1 to serve the "Wilding" Development (formerly known as East Ranch). (Requested by Southern Living and Leisure, the applicant.)
2. Consideration of a third-party beneficiary agreement concerning the creation of Travis County Fresh Water Supply District No. 1, as requested by the applicant.

Those appearing in support of the proposed "Wilding" Development:

MR. TOM LEONARD, representing Southern Living and Leisure, appeared in reference to the approval of the afore-mentioned proposals. He presented Council with a package of information in regard to their presentation. He indicated that after months of negotiations with the City Manager's office and Mr. Curtis Johnson, Director of Water and Wastewater, they were of the firm opinion that the proposal would be the best alternative for Austin in the development of this area. He noted that the creation of this fresh water supply would entail the extensions of Cow Fork and West Bull Creek (Highway 2222), which would cost Wilding \$1,419,500 and would cost the City \$742,500, of which \$665,000 would be provided for in the Capital Improvements Program No. 73/50-27. In regard to their opinion that this proposal would be the best alternative, he listed the following reasons:

1. The proposal would be better than annexation because of the expensive City services to an area 7 to 9 miles out of the limits. This, in their opinion, would cost the City more than the tax base that would be gained by the annexation.
2. Under their proposal, the City would have the alternative of waiting until the tax base was developed by the utilization of the district and district financing and could annex at such time as the economics would justify annexation.
3. Under their proposal, the Homeowners Association would be providing the security, street maintenance to a certain extent, school system within which this project would lie (Leander Independent School District), and garbage services.

He noted that the City would receive income from this area as a result of the City electric service for dwelling units only outside the City limits. He estimated the gross income from the electricity to be received by the City in the first three years of the program to be approximately \$371,070, which would pay for the indirect City services that might be generated as a result of this development.

4. This proposal would be better than a permanent tertiary treatment plant on Lake Austin, which would be an alternative for the provision of permanent sewage treatment facilities for the area.
5. Environmentally, this proposal would eliminate any risk to the City's drinking water by transporting all sanitary sewage effluent into the City collection system.
6. Economically, the proposal would be less costly to the City in the long run.
7. From a planning standpoint, this would add no new major service area to the City's original Capital Improvement Program proposal.
8. In regard to the indications that this would create developable land between Wilding and the City limits, it was his understanding that this would not be the case. The Capital Improvement Program item for the West Bull Creek extension would have been sufficiently sized to handle the drainage.
9. In regard to the objection that the proposal would generate uncontrolled growth in the area, there would be numerous controls on this development, both City and State. At this point he listed some of the agencies from which they had had to receive some sort of approval.

In addition to the areas of control by the various agencies, he noted that they had added more controls in that the third-party beneficiary contract would require the developer to make certain payments and that it would require that the district not finance certain facilities.

He indicated that they were proud of the proposed community and felt that it would afford its residents one of the highest qualities of life in Central Texas. He gave some examples of areas in which they had exceeded the requirements set by the agencies:

1. Although the Planning Commission had approved an initial comprehensive plan with approximately 16,000 dwelling units, the developer had refined this and had received Commission approval for only 11,500 units or an average density of 3.1 units per acre.
2. Although the Texas Water Quality Board would probably have permitted the temporary treatment plant, they had secured approval for an interim plant of the highest degree.
3. Although no governmental agency had required it of them, they had hired professionals to prepare an environmental impact analysis and statement.

4. The restrictive covenants which would govern the use of this property would impose safeguards for the quality of life which were not required by any City ordinance or State law. He cited an example as being the creation of an Environmental Quality Committee to approve such items as cutting of trees.

In conclusion, he introduced Caudill, Rowlett, and Scott of Houston (CRS) which had provided the engineering, planning and certain architectural consultant services for this project. He stated that in selecting its consultants, the developer had found that CRS had the most integrated package of consulting services.

MR. GARLAND S. ANDERSON, JR., Vice-President and Land and Urban Development Specialist for CRS, made a slide presentation giving some idea of the scope of planning that had gone into Wilding. He noted that the site had been acquired in early 1973 with the intention of building the finest residential area in Austin. He discussed the basic steps taken in this endeavor:

1. Preparation of conceptional plan for the total 3511 acres.
2. Preparation of detailed master plan of the 3511 acres.
3. Phase I development plan for a 1200-acre parcel.
4. Series of project plans for 10 to 100-acre parcels.

He indicated that planning had actually started in February, 1973, and estimated that they had spent about 100 man years on the project. He noted that from the beginning they had worked very closely with the City, and the staff had joined them on occasions at the site and on field trips. He listed Southern Living and Leisure's basic objectives as being:

1. Preservation of the natural features of the site.
2. Creation of a community with a variety of life styles all in one place.
3. Creation of a physically integrated community.

In reference to the environmental analysis of the land, they categorized it in three major types:

1. Regional - Wilding would be about 25 minutes to the Capitol.
2. Vicinity - property adjacent would be primarily agricultural and recreational uses with the principle geographical area being Lake Austin.
3. Site itself - slopes, drainage, vegetation, wildlife with Panther Hollow being the principle feasibility feature.

He listed the three major access roads as being Ranch Road 2222, City Park Road, and Ranch Road 620. In reference to the plan itself, he listed three major principles:

1. That the plan respond to the land form of the site in proportion to slopes.
2. That the plan incorporate man-made amenities to compliment natural features.
3. That the plan maintain and enhance the quality of the natural environment.

In conclusion, he indicated that it had been an extremely challenging project not only in terms of manpower but in scope.

DR. ROBERT H. PARKER, President Coastal Ecosystems Management, Inc., Ft. Worth, and Professor at Plano University, Dallas, appeared with regard to the environmental analysis, which he had conducted. He stated that they had done a complete environmental base line study of the Wilding area and surrounding region using five scientists in the field. He noted that the survey came out with a 175-page document completely covering all aspects of the environment, which had been an ecological study basically covering the following:

1. Completion of geologic map of 8 units which were exposed in the area.
2. Completion of a detailed study of ground water source.
3. Determination of structural geology, slope radiance, erosion susceptibility, construction capability, and mineral resources.
4. Construction of typical cross-sections.
5. Completion of soil analyses and determination of their physical and chemical characteristics for construction and agriculture.
6. Mapping of plant communities.
7. Identification of all species of trees and flowering plants and bushes.
8. Determination of both aesthetic and commercial value of the trees.
9. Recommendations for retention of valuable trees and plant communities and completion of a list of rare and endangered plant species.
10. Completion of a base line study of water quality by taking water samples.
11. Determination of water quality during a high rainfall period when run-off was coming off the area across the lake from Wilding.

He indicated that by using this information, recommendations were made as to areas suitable for the construction of roads, housing, golf courses, marina, and parks; and an overall pre-planning map was supplied to CRS for use in establishing an environmentally acceptable master plan. He added that one of the problems which needed to be addressed was the preparation of an erosion susceptibility map and determination of areas sensitive to wave cutting, stream cutting and sheet wash. At this point he noted that shore line erosion had been taking place at the rate of 1 foot per five years. Using maps of geology, slopes, and erosional susceptibility, he stated that they constructed another map of constructional capability combining all factors considered important in construction within the area and that the areas of highest erosional susceptibility and highest slope were made into maps which they recommended to CRS to place roads to avoid areas of bad erosion. His contention was that to their knowledge the detailed mapping of these units as existing had not been done before for any other type of development. In conclusion, he felt that CRS had come up with a master plan which was acceptable to them. In response to Councilman Friedman's question, Dr. Parker stated that they had looked at the entire 3500 acres and the adjacent area and that in Lake Austin they had sampled a distance of about nine miles. In terms of wildlife, he added that they had a wildlife management specialist who had sampled all the aquatic areas, completed a bird census, and completed a survey of as much of the botanical and zoological life as possible.

MR. HUGH LEON HOWARD, registered landscape architect, addressed himself to the matter of run-off from lawns and the Wilding area as it would be developed, the effect of fertilization, herbicides, and insecticides.

MR. CLARK RECTOR, marketing and economic analyst in Austin, appeared in reference to the economic impact Wilding would have on Austin. He indicated that with or without this development there would be growth because people were having children at a faster rate than those dying, which had contributed to over one-third of the growth over the last 20 years. Without anyone moving in, Austin would have to generate an additional 1791 new jobs per year until 1990 (the completion year of Wilding). He listed Wilding's contribution to this additional job base:

1. 780 permanent (over the life of the project) construction jobs.
2. 715 commercial jobs.
3. 100 jobs involved in construction of recreational and other amenity features.
4. 50 recreational operational jobs.

He discussed the housing opportunities that would be created at Wilding within a 15-20 year period. He noted that the base price for the housing to be proposed would be \$28,000; and based on income distribution in Austin, 45% of the households would qualify. In response to Councilman Handcox's questions, Mr. Rector noted that the figures had been an update by them of a 1970 census based on income distributions and that at that time 45% of the households had incomes of \$10,540 or more. In response to Councilman Binder's question, Mr. Rector noted that the \$28,000 was not a single family house but was a townhouse and that the lowest priced house on a separate lot would be in the upper \$30,000 range.

MR. AL SIMONS appeared and read a letter from MR. DAVE GRAEBER, an architect and planner, to the Council in support of "the concept of well-reserved, thoughtful, and responsive planning." Mr. Graeber felt that the extensive effort in the formulation of this plan by the planners, developers, and City staff would result in a development to which Austin could look with pride. He felt that the concept and resulting form of this plan would be a direct response to the following:

1. Environmental concerns of recent years.
2. Social characteristics and patterns.
3. Physical and land use considerations.
4. Governmental policy and regulations.
5. Economic trends.

Because of the working relationship among the developer, the design firm, and the planning staff of the City, he felt that every issue had been carefully considered, every detail solved with an overall result of a plan with very high quality. Mr. Graeber noted that he was a great supporter of the revitalization of the central area of the City and his concerns were that it be healthy and viable. In conclusion, Mr. Graeber requested that the Council give favorable consideration to this development.

MR. ALAN TANIGUCHI stated that there were several means of directing growth in that the City could plan the urban structures and by their location and designation could influence the pattern of development that would follow. He added that another means of directing growth patterns would be through zoning, to control land use. He reviewed various zoning designations. At this point he noted that he had served on the Planning Commission for two terms during 1968 and 1972. He also discussed the Planned Unit Development process in that it required several reviews by the City Planning Department and Commission before coming to Council for final review. He felt that by going the Planned Unit Development route, the developer was faced with a substantial financial commitment. He noted that there had been over 3/4 million dollars spent on the Wilding project. He added that his firm had been retained to plan a 112-acre Planned Unit Development in Wilding and that they were interested in producing an environmentally responsive plan. He felt that Wilding should be approved on its own merits and that the quality standards set by it could help influence standard and future developments. He further felt that the fact that all possible means to create opportunities that would encourage a cultural and economic mix in the resident make-up at Wilding had not been fully explored. He indicated that living at Wilding would be a matter of personal choice and his concern was to open that choice to as many people as possible. He noted that the developer had assured him that they would retain a consultant throughout the project. In conclusion, he requested that the Council encourage the kind of serious effort that had gone into the planning of the Wilding project by voting for its approval.

At this point Mr. Leonard indicated that this would end their formal presentation and requested that anyone wanting to testify on Wilding's behalf yield his position; however, he requested that those in support stand as indication to Council of this support.

MRS. LAUREN HUDGENS, resident of Austin for about 11 years, indicated that she and her husband had owned property on the lake for some time. She noted that she had called the developers of Wilding and asked pertinent questions, and she and her husband had toured the property and were very impressed with the plans involved to preserve the quality of Lake Austin. She also felt that development on Lake Austin included unsanitary and unsightly house boat areas, unkempt concession establishments, and many enlarged boat docks which had become makeshift but permanent living quarters. She indicated that she much preferred the type of planning that had gone into Wilding, which could be a model development that Austin could be proud of.

MS. JUDY MALKIN, member of the Goals Program and Goals Assembly in the Austin Tomorrow Program, spoke in favor of the proposal. She noted that at the meetings people had expressed a number of views, among them:

1. The future growth of the City should be well planned.
2. More green spaces.
3. More recreational area.
4. More communities where people could live and work and have recreation all in the same general area.
5. Neighborhoods should be set up for walking or bicycling, not driving.
6. Tree ordinances.
7. Underground utilities.
8. Preservation of the environment before a development should be allowed to occur.

They felt that Southern Living and Leisure and its plans for Wilding had taken all the items into consideration. She felt that if Council voted against the fresh water district, they would be voting for continued piecemeal subdivisions by people who did not have the interests, time and/or money to do the planning Southern Living and Leisure had done. She also felt that by voting for the development, the Council would be serving notice on other developers that these would be the kinds of standards and developments that would have to be met. In conclusion, she urged their support of the proposal.

MR. JACK RAY felt that he had the right to speak because he had completed a million dollar restaurant across the street from the Wilding project. He mentioned the fact that he had built the Barn Restaurant a few years ago. He felt that Wilding was a "first-class organization" and that it would be great to have them as neighbors because they could produce a lot of good customers for him.

MR. C. B. SMITH, SR., felt that this had been the most unique Council meeting he had ever attended in that the presentations made had been superb. He reminded the citizens that Austin had been called the city "with the violet crown." He noted that he represented a group of people who had labored and worked for Austin to make it as progressive as it had been. In reference to the crown, he pictured the development as being in the fringes of this "violet crown" and believed that this operation could be a star in the crown of Austin.

MR. BRUCE ANDERSON felt that the developers of Wilding had applied standards of planning in excess than ever before. He discussed what a vote one way or the other would communicate to the development community. In his opinion, the most serious consequence of a vote against this formation would be that it would communicate to the subdividers that there would be no point in trying to put together a large, aesthetically coordinated, ecologically and environmentally sound project; and the most convenient approach for making money in the Austin market would be by slipping through a lot of scattered spot zones and uncoordinated subdivisions. He felt that a vote to delay a decision would have much the same effect as a denial but would not satisfy either those for or against the issue. He noted that a vote to permit the water district and sewer extension would permit the Wilding community to integrate with the existing Austin community in the most sensible manner for both and that Council would assume an additional burden. He mentioned the area between the current City limits and the Wilding boundary which would also be served by the sewer extension. He strongly urged the Council to consider that a vote for the water district would carry with it the responsibility for seeing that any development taking place between Austin and Wilding meet the same strict standards of planning that Wilding had already met at least until the new master plan could set more or less stringent standards in the area. He further recommended that Council consider applying some or all of the Wilding standards to any new subdivisions within its jurisdiction. He felt that this would communicate that Austin was willing to accept growth but only if it was sensibly planned and well-controlled.

MR. JAMES McCROCKLIN from Wimberley, Texas, and neighbor of Southern Living and Leisure, felt that they had met every commitment in the area and had been excellent neighbors; and he commended them and recommended their endorsement.

Those appearing in opposition to the proposed "Wilding" Development and/or in support of an impact study:

MS. MILLIE di DONATO, Chairman of Travis County Democratic Women's Committee, felt that Council was considering the expenditure of a huge sum for a sewer line and that granting approval of a fresh water supply district would be an action which would facilitate leapfrogging. They felt that there appeared to be a contradiction in policy because of the arguments raised on March 28, 1974, in reference to the refund contract policy. They believed that the ramifications of this decision were of such magnitude that Council should take more time and give more citizens more time to study the complex issues involved.

MS. EDITH BUSS, resident at 3318 Perry Lane, felt that Wilding was very impressive but that it was a far cry from Father Fred Underwood's project of homes under \$20,000, the Country Club Gardens in Montopolis. She noted that one concern was that the project would be a total electric community. She reviewed figures involved in converting natural gas to electricity. She noted that perhaps the \$371,000 gross income from the electricity would be a valid point, but that she did not know what the net income would be and thought this should be considered very seriously especially at this time of an energy crisis.

MR. CHARLES CLELAND, representing a group called the Save the Lake Association, urged the Council to exercise its legal powers and responsibilities to protect the public water supply of Austin and to protect other public interests by developing and adopting as soon as possible a comprehensive plan for land development and use within the drainage basin of Lake Austin. They further

urged the Council, pending adoption of such a plan, to exercise extreme caution in taking actions that would encourage land development within the drainage basin of Lake Austin and especially near the shore line of this lake. They felt that no such action should be taken until preparation and review of a thorough environmental impact statement be completed by the appropriate official agencies of the City.

MS. CAROL WYCHE, representing Ecology Action, felt that this project had been very well planned but had only one major objection, that being the use of tax money to the advantage of developers. She felt that the time had come to change the policy of Austin. Mayor Butler noted that the amount of money involved would have nothing to do with taxes and that this would be a revenue bond and would not be an obligation of the tax payers.

MR. DAVE DORSETT encouraged Council not to take action to approve the fresh water district or the plans for extension of the Wilding development because he believed it was premature to offer such assistance in this. He noted that for the past few months citizens had been participating in Goals meetings with the understanding that their work would mean something and it would form the basis for a new master plan that would incorporate citizens' views on what they wanted the area to become. He felt that approval of either of these proposals would undercut the entire meaning of the Goals for Austin Tomorrow Program. He felt that one of the clearest expressions of the citizens had been that they did not want another Houston in Austin. He noted that the main point was that the Austin Tomorrow Program and the Goals Assembly Program had enlisted the aid of thousands of Austin's citizens, and a lot of people had put a lot of time and work into this with the understanding that it would mean something. In response to Mayor Pro Tem Love's question, Mr. Dorsett indicated that he was a candidate for County Commissioner in Precinct 2. Councilman Dryden noted that the Council and the Planning Commission were appreciative of the time the Goals Assembly and Austin Tomorrow Program had given.

MR. KEVIN BURNETTE discussed the highway statistics and felt there was a discrepancy between the figures of the Highway Department and Wilding. He also discussed the density of the project and felt that it could increase. He mentioned Panther Hollow and the effect construction would have on the run-off into Panther Hollow. He felt that Wilding would not provide permanent employment. He noted that he had not seen an impact statement and felt that statements by representatives of Wilding were biased and that Wilding would encourage premature growth. In conclusion, he stated that the citizens should know the full and objective story on what effects Wilding would have on the environment.

MS. PATRICIA HAKES, representing the Allandale Neighborhood Association, requested the postponement of a decision on the project in that they were concerned with the traffic on Ranch Road 2222 and with this type of leapfrogging extension of City services. In conclusion, she noted that they felt there were already many areas within the City limits that needed money, time and concern.

MR. MIKE SMITH, member of the Ad Hoc Committee to Save the Hill Country and member of Save Austin's Valuable Environment, read a statement in which they felt that it would be ill-suited for the City to give support to a development of the magnitude and impact of Wilding. They urged the Council for a more thorough investigation of Wilding's impact to Austin's environment and expressed their particular concern that this project and all other subdivisions lying

within the Extraterritorial Jurisdiction of the City be suspended until a master plan could be formulated that would reflect the desires of the Goals Assembly. It was their belief that the City must move beyond the field of mere regulation and begin to take an active role in the location and timing of new developments. They felt there had been too little input by the public into land use planning decisions. They encouraged Council to use whatever means possible to restore the balance between public and private interests. He cited a meeting that had occurred among two members of the Ad Hoc Committee and the development firm. An impact statement had been referred to in the meeting, and a request had been refused by the developers to honor a review of the statement. They believed that the balance of interests was threatened when private corporations could commission studies of the environment and make them known or keep them secret at their discretion. He further noted that the impact statement had not been submitted to any of the Citizen Review Boards. They urged Council to review the impact statement of the Wilding developers and to commission an independent study of the impacts of the Cow Fork sewer extension and that the study be done before a decision to extend services should be reached. In conclusion, he reminded the Council of the number of households that would be participating in the bond election should the permit be approved for a fresh water supply district. They believed this level of commitment would preclude the opportunity to make the hill country a part of those policy discussions for Austin's tomorrow.

MR. JOE RIDDELL appeared as a concerned citizen of Austin. In his opinion, the Council's consent to the fresh water supply district would result in the future assumption by the citizens of some \$18 to \$30 million of debt to pay toward the installation of water and sewer pipes within the proposed district and that this debt would work a disproportionate burden on persons living within the established areas of Austin. He urged Council to deny the proposal of the fresh water supply district. He discussed the bonds that would be necessary to finance the water and sewer installations within Wilding in that they would be 30-year bonds with a principal of \$13.9 million and anticipated interest rate would be 7-1/2%, resulting in an interest of some \$22.6 million; and the amount of money which would have to be paid back on these bonds would come to some \$36.5 million. He asked who would pay back this \$36.5 million. In answer to this question, he noted that as long as Wilding were to remain outside the City limits, the persons living there would pay the bill through their taxes; however, once the district were to be annexed, the City would assume the remaining bonded indebtedness and all the citizens would share the burden of this cost. He reviewed a chart showing the amount of bonded indebtedness the City would assume if the district were to be annexed after various periods of time using projected population figures submitted by the City. He further reviewed a chart showing the contribution toward retiring the bonded indebtedness that the average home purchaser in Wilding would make in that each water and sewer connection would be approximately \$8,500 per household. In summary, he noted that only about one-half of the total cost of the sewer connection to each individual unit would be paid for by that home owner and that the remaining would come from the residents of Austin not residing in the Wilding district. (He noted that this projection was based on the fact that Wilding was annexed into the City after 15 years.) He reiterated that he was only discussing the proposals for Fresh Water Supply District No. 1 and not the entire area. In reference to the election to be held on the bonds to be purchased, he noted that only five families would vote. In conclusion, he felt that it was time for the Council to prevent this use of bonding authority of the fresh water supply district and spreading the cost of sewage and water in Wilding to Austinites.

MR. LES GAGE, Chairman of the Citizens Board of Natural Resources and Environmental Quality, noted that what he would say would not be the consensus of the Board in that they had not had a meeting since this had come before the Council. He complimented the Wilding people and CRS and all involved. He reviewed a meeting held in December in which one of the matters discussed was the extension of the sewer line up East Bull Creek, at which time Mr. Homer Reed, Deputy City Manager; Mr. Curtis Johnson, Director of Water and Wastewater; and Mr. Dick Lillie, Director of Planning, were present and spoke in favor of the extension. The possibility of an environmental impact statement had been discussed, and Mr. Gage noted that Mr. Lillie had commented about how important this kind of study would be. Mr. Gage felt that the developers had done as many good things as anyone in recent years in planning a project of this kind; however, he felt a basic question had to be answered in developing a policy for the City. He stated that the question revolved around the area between the City limits and the Wilding project, approximately 8 or 9 miles up West Bull Creek and discussed the possibility of development of a subdivision in this area. He felt that it would be better to plan the growth in a more orderly manner and to plan to provide all services as the land were to develop according to this plan. He noted that the citizens did not know what the impact would be on that 9-mile area between Austin and Wilding and had no data on which to base any conclusions or assumptions. In his opinion, Austin needed an impact statement on the entire drainage basin to know what kind of responsibility the City would be acquiring and whether or not to extend this sewer line. He did not feel this was a question of growth or no growth but a question of proper planning.

At this point Mayor Butler noted that there was a trend in Washington to go regional in that the City would be forced to serve a large area and many even incorporated communities around the City with regional sewer treatment facilities to protect the overall environment. He further added that he was concerned with the disposal of the effluent discharge and that his primary concern was to protect Lake Austin.

MR. STEVE MCGUIRE, representative of the Travis County Young Democrats, noted that he was candidate for a precinct position. He indicated that they supported issues and candidates in support of ecologically sound proposals and that they believed the Wilding development represented a profound threat to the hill country and Austin itself for the following reasons:

1. Would increase burden of taxation to finance road construction, hospitals, fire and police protection.
2. Would be an increase in expanding power generation capacities.
3. Would accelerate population growth attracted to this development.
4. Would be tremendous rise in commercial development.

In conclusion, they asked for a delay until some analysis by people apart from the project could be obtained of the environmental impact.

MR. ERWIN MCGEE, member of the Executive Committee of the University of Texas Young Democrats and member of the Student Action Committee and former Treasurer of Travis County, appeared in reference to the following:

1. His understanding that one of Austin Tomorrow's primary goals was anti-growth or the growth issue particularly. However, he felt that they had not had time or the information to consider this. He felt that they should have the opportunity to look at this further.
2. His understanding that Ranch Road 2222 fed into Balcones Road. He felt there would be excessive congestion.
3. He felt that there should be an independent study on this issue and more time allowed for a decision.
4. He felt that Highland Lakes area and 2222 was the precious area of Austin.
5. He felt that the students were en masse against Wilding.

In conclusion, he requested that this be postponed for further study.

MR. MICHAEL EAKIN, citizen of Austin, noted that he was vitally concerned that Council study the impact of Wilding and any other development. He felt that this was a very political and heated issue and commended the integrity of both groups. He suggested that the Council look at some of the implications in the issue in a reasonable manner to the best protection to be provided to the hill country:

1. Felt this was not a question of no growth versus growth at the City's present rate.

Felt citizens were facing type and nature and location of this growth. He thought that the flood plains should be reviewed. He noted that Wilding had taken careful preparations but that it was their impact statement.

2. When the impact statement was discussed, he felt that no facts or figures had been given on the impact on Lake Austin. He suggested that perhaps Lake Austin were a valuable enough resource that this should be reviewed longer and expertise be brought in to review the impact and other developments occurring along the Lake.
3. In regard to bonded indebtedness, he noted that those interested had not found out until about three days ago the extent of the City's bonded indebtedness that would be required to pay off in the event of annexation Wilding's district.

He further felt that the City would be taxed to its fullest financial capacity to pay for the services and suggested that before the City leapfrog into this, the Council should look at Town Lake and Barton Creek; and the City should undertake a careful analysis of what would happen to the hill country and planning of all factors including transit, developments occurring adjacent, pollution of Lake Austin, overtaking, and the type of bonded indebtedness referred to.

Council Discussion

In response to Councilman Handcox's question as to what Wilding would provide Austin other than liability, Mr. Tom Leonard appeared again to discuss several items in the relationship of the development and the City:

1. Would provide a community that had been well-planned and could be an asset of the City at such time as the City should decide to annex it.
2. Would provide income to the City to defray the indirect cost of some City services. (The income would come from the use of the electric utility.)

In response to Councilman Handcox's question as to the cost of installation of lines for the area, Mr. Leonard thought that as he understood it the cost to the City would be approximately \$600 per single family dwelling unit, which he noted was what the cost would be inside the City. He indicated that should the City desire to annex a portion of the development, it could annex a portion of the fresh water supply district without assuming any of the bonded indebtedness of the district. Councilman Handcox felt that Wilding was promoting more of the type of development where the inner City was left to low-middle income and minorities. In reference to the City's liability, Mr. Leonard did not deny the fact that there would be some indirect City costs attributable to the number of people at Wilding but noted that there would be some direct City income and indirect City income as a result of the development as well. In reference to the core city, he stated that they were asking for a development that would be inside a district strictly controlled under the extraterritorial jurisdiction policy of the City.

In response to Mayor Pro Tem Love's question as to a delay in order to make an impact study, Mr. Leonard pointed out that they had been in the process of planning for about 14 months and that a delay at this point would be very detrimental to their plans and felt it imperative that some decision be reached by Council. Mayor Butler noted that it seemed to be the major concern of those appearing that a study be made. At this point Councilman Handcox announced that he had just received the knowledge that the current plans would not include improvements of the City Park roads which connected Ranch Road 2222 to Lake Austin Metropolitan Park and had not had the opportunity to review other matters in terms of impact.

In response to Mayor Butler's question, Mr. Dan Davidson, City Manager, felt that in 45 to 60 days the staff could make a study of the one already completed by the developers and answer a number of questions. There was further discussion by Councilman Friedman as to the fact that he felt the 9-mile area of road between Wilding and the City limits should be looked into as well as the total Lake area. He noted that the Wilding impact statement was probably as fine a statement as any developer had ever produced but that

it was only for Wilding. Councilman Binder agreed that Wilding had done an exemplary job of planning and measuring the impact of what would happen to Wilding and was interested in an impartial study. At this point Mr. Homer Reed, Deputy City Manager, outlined the Council's alternatives that had been reported to Council on this subject last year and the three alternative methods of responding to requests for the creation of new utility districts:

1. Denial of all requests for new districts within the extra-territorial area.
2. Annexation of all urbanizing portions of the extraterritorial jurisdiction.
3. Approval of utility districts in such a way as to retain firm Council control over their development plans and financing programs.

He noted that the staff had attempted to negotiate an agreement with Wilding that would retain for the Council an optimum level of control over development plans and financing programs and that their efforts were successful. The staff felt that the proposed agreement would provide the Council with the maximum amount of control permissible under existing state law. He added that if the district were to be approved, it had been recommended that the proposed third-party beneficiary agreement also be approved. He made the following comments on the Council's other alternatives:

1. Council could approve the district and the third-party agreement after deleting all provisions for the construction of a sewer connection between Wilding and Austin.

He mentioned a variation of this being the possibility of making the sewer connection available at the City's option.

2. The request for creation of a new water district could be denied. It would be likely that such denial would result in a request to the City for provision of utility services. Under this plan, the sewer connection would be constructed, water and sewer systems within the subdivision would be installed by the developer, dedicated by public usage and operated by the City under a contract with the developer.
3. Annexation of the proposed development. Further study would be required to determine the economic feasibility of this alternative.

Should the request be denied, he noted that this would not preclude the development but that it would be slowed to some extent since the developers would no longer be able to obtain the approximately \$14 million in tax-exempt bond money to finance the water and sewer systems within the development. City Manager Davidson noted that whatever the Council did would not necessarily stop the development of Wilding. He indicated that he was most impressed with the fact that this was probably one of the best conceived, most thorough plan development that had ever been presented to the Planning Commission or to Council and that even though there were some things some of the staff did not particularly like about water districts or utility districts, these applicants worked with all

City's staff and department heads feeling that they were following the rules established by Council in June, 1973, and the City helped them do it. In conclusion, he stated that they would complete any studies requested before or after consideration of the proposal; but he felt it was ready for consideration, and he recommended approval.

There was discussion by Council as to the various options available and whether or not a decision should be made before or after the study. There was further discussion among Mr. Davidson, Mr. Lillie, and Councilman Handcox in regard to the content of the study. In response to Mayor Pro Tem Love's question as to what the staff would know in four days that it did not know then, Mr. Lillie indicated that there had been a number of subdivisions that had been filed in the northwest area that they could analyze with respect to the circulation of the type of subdivision that it would be in and their immediate needs with respect to Austin facilities, the timing of the West loop, circulation pattern there, capacity of 2222, and the major directions of growth in the community with respect to the next five or ten-year period.

Motion

Councilman Handcox moved that Council delay action for 45 days until the completion of an impact study with regard to transportation and other immediate problems that might be experienced in connection with any major development in that area. Mayor Pro Tem Love seconded the motion.

Mayor Butler noted that good points had been made in support of and in opposition to the project but that there were many reservations. He asked Mr. Leonard if they could agree to a 45-day delay in order to answer some of the questions. Mr. Leonard considered any additional delays at this time as prejudicial; the cost, interest cost, and overhead cost of carrying this project had now accumulated to about \$5,000 a day for a total of 2-1/2 million dollars to date and that a delay of 45 days would violate the economic feasibility.

At this point MR. MATT STEPOVICH appeared and noted that the people from Wilding had made a good presentation but that 45 days was not long enough for the citizens of Austin, and he thought that possibly Council was "rushing headlong into this."

Councilman Dryden noted that a lot of good points had been made but that a decision should be made. In response to Mayor Pro Tem Love's question, Mr. Leonard indicated that they would like a vote one way or the other and added that if the case were that the concern pertained to the land between their development and the City limits (hence dealing primarily with the part of the proposal which would be the City sewer line), they had no objection to making that optional, at the City's option, so that any kind of study needed to be done in order for the City to exercise that option could be done in whatever period of time it would take.

At this point Mayor Pro Tem Love withdrew his second to Councilman Handcox's motion, and Councilman Friedman seconded Councilman Handcox's motion.

Substitute Motion

Mayor Pro Tem Love moved that the Council approve the recommendation of the City Manager in that the proposed Travis County Fresh Water Supply District No. 1 be created to serve the Wilding Development. Councilman Dryden seconded the substitute motion.

Roll call on the substitute motion showed the following vote:

Ayes: Mayor Pro Tem Love, Councilmen Dryden, Mayor Butler
Noes: Councilmen Binder, Friedman, Handcox, Lebermann

The Mayor announced that the motion had failed to carry.

Councilman Binder noted during the roll call that he did not believe it was the time to vote and felt that they were not supplied with the information to be voting. He noted that it was a quality development and quality development should be encouraged.

Councilman Lebermann indicated that he needed additional input from the Planning Department.

At this point Councilman Handcox withdrew his original motion, and Councilman Friedman withdrew his second to the motion.

Second Substitute Motion

After discussion, Councilman Lebermann moved that the decision be delayed until May 9, 1974, pending a report on the profiled information with respect to items mentioned earlier by Mr. Lillie, including the timing of the West loop, circulation pattern, capacity of 2222, and the major directions of growth in the community with respect to the next five or ten-year period. The motion, seconded by Councilman Dryden, carried by the following vote:

Ayes: Councilmen Lebermann, Dryden, Mayor Butler, Mayor Pro Tem Love
Noes: Councilmen Friedman, Handcox, Binder

Councilman Friedman noted at the time he voted that he wanted the study but not in the terms that they were getting.

Councilman Handcox stated that he felt he was being "railroaded."

The Council recessed at 5:00 p.m.

Mayor Butler called the meeting to order at 5:20 p.m.

HEARING TO AMEND ZONING ORDINANCE

Mayor Butler opened the public hearing scheduled for 1:00 p.m. to amend the zoning ordinance to allow fifty-foot structures on lots between sixty and sixty-five feet in width. Mr. Lillie noted that a letter had been received requesting an amendment be added noting that the average width of a lot may be used to determine the required side yard widths, with neither side to be less than five feet.

Mayor Butler introduced the following ordinance:

AN ORDINANCE AMENDING CHAPTER 45 OF THE CODE OF THE CITY OF AUSTIN OF 1967, BY PROVIDING CERTAIN SIDE YARD REQUIREMENTS FOR LOTS SIXTY TO SIXTY-FIVE FEET IN WIDTH; SUSPENDING THE RULE REQUIRING THE READING OF ORDINANCES ON THREE SEPARATE DAYS; AND DECLARING AN EMERGENCY.

Mayor Pro Tem Love moved that the Council waive the requirement for three readings, declare an emergency and finally pass the ordinance effective immediately, with the afore-mentioned amendment. The motion, seconded by Councilman Friedman, carried by the following vote:

Ayes: Councilmen Friedman, Lebermann, Mayor Butler, Mayor Pro Tem Love, Councilmen Binder, Dryden

Noes: None

Not in Council Chamber when roll was called: Councilman Handcox

The Mayor announced the ordinance had been finally passed.

ZONING HEARINGS

Mayor Butler announced that the Council would hear the zoning cases scheduled for 1:00 p.m. for public hearing at this time. Pursuant to published notice thereof, the following zoning applications were publicly heard:

P. M. BRYANT, ET UX	112-114 Coleman Street	From "A" Residence
By David Woodland, Jr.		To "B" Residence (as amended)
C14-74-009		RECOMMENDED by the Planning Commission as amended, subject to a 6' privacy fence on the western and southern property lines; restricting the tract to parking only; and with no access to Coleman Street

Mr. Dick Lillie stated that a valid petition had been filed. Mr. Martin Boozer, representing the applicant, noted that when the petition was circulated, some of the petitioners were misinformed and had withdrawn their names. He stated that there had been an error in the area covered in the application, and the application was amended. He mentioned that the property was to be used as additional parking for a Mexican food restaurant fronting on South Congress Avenue. Discussion on curb cuts was held, and it was stated that there would not be any additional curb cuts on Coleman Street.

Councilman Friedman moved that the Council grant "B" Residence District as recommended by the Planning Commission subject to conditions. The motion, seconded by Councilman Lebermann, carried by the following vote:

Ayes: Councilmen Handcox, Lebermann, Mayor Butler, Mayor Pro Tem Love, Councilmen Binder, Dryden, Friedman

Noes: None

The Mayor announced that the change had been granted to "B" Residence District, as amended, subject to conditions, and the City Attorney was instructed to draw the necessary ordinance to cover.

Zoning Denied

NORENCE LANCE
By James C. Lance
C14-74-018

5537 Decker Lake Road

From Interim "A" Residence
1st Height and Area
To "C-2" Commercial
1st Height and Area
NOT Recommended by the
Planning Commission.
RECOMMENDED "C-2" on the
1,200 square foot portion of
the building to be used as
a lounge and "GR" General
Retail on the remaining area.

Mr. Lillie stated that a valid petition had been filed in opposition. Mr. James C. Lance, representing the applicant indicated that they wanted to have the "C-2" Commercial zoning as requested; and if that were not granted, they wanted to continue to use the property as "GR" General Retail. He noted that for the past two years a portion of the building had been used for a floor-covering business, and the owner wanted to convert this portion for a lounge.

Motion

Councilman Lebermann moved to grant "GR" General Retail on the entire tract. The motion was seconded by Mayor Pro Tem Love.

Discussion of granting "GR" General Retail District was held. Mr. John Selman opposed the change to either "C-2" Commercial or "GR" as "GR" would permit a restaurant with the sale of mixed drinks or beer and wine. He noted that he did not oppose the office building. The City Attorney, Mr. Don Butler, stated that in a non-conforming use any use would be allowed that would be permitted in that same zone district, but the building could not be structurally altered.

Substitute Motion

Councilman Lebermann moved that the Council deny the change on "C-2" Commercial District. (This was left in a non-conforming status). The motion, seconded by Councilman Dryden, carried by the following vote:

Ayes: Mayor Butler, Mayor Pro Tem Love, Councilmen Binder, Dryden,
Friedman, Handcox, Lebermann

Noes: None

The Mayor announced that the change had been DENIED.

Zonings Withdrawn

GULF OIL CORPORATION
C14-74-017

7504 North Inter-
regional Highway 35

From "C" Commercial
6th Height and Area
To "C" Commercial
2nd Height and Area
RECOMMENDED by the Planning
Commission

It was noted that this request was withdrawn by the
applicant.

EDNA HOUSTON and
ROBERT J. HAMMOND
By Martin Boozer, Jr.
C14-74-023

1604-1606 East 19th
Street
1900-1904 Leona
Street

From "A" Residential
To "LR" Local Retail
NOT Recommended by the
Planning Commission

Mayor Pro Tem Love moved that the Council withdraw this
application. The motion, seconded by Councilman Handcox,
carried by the following vote:

Ayes: Mayor Pro Tem Love, Councilmen Binder, Dryden, Friedman, Handcox,
Lebermann, Mayor Butler

Noes: None

RELEASE OF EASEMENT

Councilman Friedman moved that the Council adopt a resolution authorizing
release of the following easement:

Drainage and public utilities easement ten (10.00) feet in
width in Lot 1, ST. ELMO INDUSTRIAL SUBDIVISION, and Lot 2-A,
ST. ELMO INDUSTRIAL SUBDIVISION A, and of the public utilities
easement five (5.00) feet in width across the rear of said
Lot 2-A. (Requested by Mr. B. F. Priest, Registered Public
Surveyor, as agent for Mr. Odas Jung, owner.)

The motion, seconded by Councilman Lebermann, carried by the following vote:

Ayes: Councilmen Binder, Dryden, Friedman, Handcox, Lebermann, Mayor
Butler, Mayor Pro Tem Love

Noes: None

LICENSE AGREEMENT PERMITTING ENCROACHMENT

Councilman Friedman moved that the Council adopt a resolution authoriz-
ing the following license agreement:

License agreement between the City of Austin and POINT VISTA LINK, INC., permitting encroachment of concrete walks and planter boxes upon the public utilities easement 21.18 feet in width, which extends from the west line of Aberdeen Way in a westerly direction the full length of Block H, POINT VISTA, SECTIONS TWO & THREE, along the rear of lots in said Block H and across the Community Club Area in Block H, Resubdivision of Lots 7, 8 & 13, POINT VISTA, SECTIONS TWO & THREE. (Requested by Point Vista Link, Inc., owner of all the effected properties.)

The motion, seconded by Councilman Lebermann, carried by the following vote:

Ayes: Councilmen Binder, Dryden, Friedman, Handcox, Lebermann,
Mayor Butler, Mayor Pro Tem Love
Noes: None

LICENSE AGREEMENT TO INSTALL WATER MAIN

Councilman Friedman moved that the Council adopt a resolution authorizing the following license agreement:

Authorizing the Deputy City Manager to enter into a license agreement with MISSOURI PACIFIC RAILROAD COMPANY to install a 6-inch ductile iron water main beneath the Missouri Pacific's Railroad tracks at Mile Post 179+2708 (Engineer's chainage station 9475+35) in Austin, Texas.

The motion, seconded by Councilman Lebermann, carried by the following vote:

Ayes: Councilmen Binder, Dryden, Friedman, Handcox, Lebermann,
Mayor Butler, Mayor Pro Tem Love
Noes: None

CONTRACTS AWARDED

Mayor Pro Tem Love moved that the Council adopt a resolution authorizing the following contract:

UNITED CONTRACTING COMPANY	- For Jollyville Reservoir 48"
2921 Beltline Road	Feeder Main, Phase IV - \$616,194.75
Irving, Texas	

The motion, seconded by Councilman Lebermann, carried by the following vote:

Ayes: Councilmen Dryden, Friedman, Handcox, Lebermann, Mayor Butler,
Mayor Pro Tem Love, Councilman Binder
Noes: None

Mayor Pro Tem Love moved that the Council adopt a resolution authorizing the following contract:

JACK A. MILLER, INC.
11011 Research Boulevard
Austin, Texas

- A reinforced concrete multiple box culvert (3-7' x 7') in Great Northern Boulevard, Austin Northwest Subdivision - \$35,651.50.

The motion, seconded by Councilman Lebermann, carried by the following vote:

Ayes: Councilmen Dryden, Friedman, Handcox, Lebermann, Mayor Butler,
Mayor Pro Tem Love, Councilman Binder
Noes: None

Mayor Pro Tem Love moved that the Council adopt a resolution authorizing the following contract:

DALMARK, INC.
Brandt Lane
Buda, Texas

- For construction of an electric ductline at Motorola - \$17,653.30

The motion, seconded by Councilman Lebermann, carried by the following vote:

Ayes: Councilmen Dryden, Friedman, Handcox, Lebermann, Mayor Butler,
Mayor Pro Tem Love, Councilman Binder
Noes: None

Mayor Pro Tem Love moved that the Council adopt a resolution authorizing the following contracts:

Bid award:

- Miscellaneous Maintenance Equipment and Tools for Austin Transit Maintenance Facility

AUSTIN MACHINE & GRINDING COMPANY
201 East 1st Street
Austin, Texas

- Items 1.1, 1.4, 2.1, 2.3, 4.1, 4.2, 4.5, 6.1, 6.22, 7.3, 7.4, 7.6, 7.7, 7.9, 7.10, 7.11, 7.12, 7.16, 7.17, 7.21, 8.3, 9.1, 10.6, 10.7, 10.15, 10.18 and 10.19 -
Total - \$6,123.23

MUNCIE RECLAMATION &
SUPPLY COMPANY, INC.
c/o Mr. James P. Bozeman
6905 Whispering Oaks
Austin, Texas

- Items 6.5, 6.6, 6.7, 6.12, 6.13, 6.18, 6.20, 10.2, 10.3, 10.5, 10.16, 10.17 and 10.20 -
Total - \$5,061.92

The motion, seconded by Councilman Lebermann, carried by the following vote:

Ayes: Councilmen Dryden, Friedman, Handcox, Lebermann, Mayor Butler,
Mayor Pro Tem Love, Councilman Binder
Noes: None

Mayor Pro Tem Love moved that the Council adopt a resolution authorizing the following contracts:

Bid Award:	- Switches for Electric Department
ITE IMPERIAL CORPORATION	- Items 1, 2 & 5; 5 ea. @ \$6,248.00
505 Hadley	Items 3, 4, 6, 7 & 8; 22 ea. @
Houston, Texas	\$5,013.00
	Items 9 & 11; 4 ea. @ \$5,337.00
	Items 10 & 12; 7 ea. @ \$4,101.00
	Item 15; 1 ea. @ \$1,156.00
	Total \$192,737.00
ALLIS CHALMERS CORPORATION	- Item 13; 6 ea. @ \$3,006.00
310 South St. Mary's Street	Item 14; 1 ea. @ \$1,259.00
San Antonio, Texas	Item 16; 4 ea. @ \$1,250.00
	Item 17; 1 ea. @ \$1,250.00
	Total \$25,545.00

The motion, seconded by Councilman Lebermann, carried by the following vote:

Ayes: Councilmen Dryden, Friedman, Handcox, Lebermann, Mayor Butler,
Mayor Pro Tem Love, Councilman Binder
Noes: None

Mayor Pro Tem Love moved that the Council adopt a resolution authorizing the following contracts:

Bid Award:	- Trailer Mounted Pumps for Vehicle and Equipment Services Dept.
CENTRAL TEXAS EQUIPMENT COMPANY	- Item 1; 4 ea. @ \$3,405.00
127 East Riverside Drive	Item 3; 1 ea. @ \$3,522.75
Austin, Texas	Total \$17,142.75
NAYLOR SERVICE & SUPPLY COMPANY	- Item 2; 3 ea. @ \$2,560.25
1027 Stanley	Total \$7,680.75
Denton, Texas	

The motion, seconded by Councilman Lebermann, carried by the following vote:

Ayes: Councilmen Dryden, Friedman, Handcox, Lebermann, Mayor Butler,
Mayor Pro Tem Love, Councilman Binder
Noes: None

Mayor Pro Tem Love moved that the Council adopt a resolution authorizing the following contract:

MOORE BUSINESS FORMS
827 West 12th Street
Austin, Texas

- Utility Statements, Utility Payment Tickets, Utility Bill Replacements, Scanner Header Tickets and Scanner Trailer Tickets

Item 1; 1,000,000 ea. @ \$ 3.71/M

Item 2; 12,500 sets @ \$16.02/M

Item 3; 25,000 ea. @ \$10.95/M

Item 4; 100,000 ea. @ \$10.95/M

Item 5; 100,000 ea. @ \$10.95/M

Total \$6,374.00

The motion, seconded by Councilman Lebermann, carried by the following vote:

Ayes: Councilmen Dryden, Friedman, Handcox, Lebermann, Mayor Butler,
Mayor Pro Tem Love, Councilman Binder

Noes: None

COST DIFFERENCE PAYMENTS

Mayor Pro Tem Love moved that the Council adopt a resolution authorizing payment to WILLIAM B. COTTON, President of Spicewood Development Corporation, the cost difference of 12"/8" water main and appurtenances in Spicewood at Balcones Village, Section 2 - \$6,901.65. The motion, seconded by Councilman Lebermann, carried by the following vote:

Ayes: Councilmen Friedman, Handcox, Lebermann, Mayor Butler,
Mayor Pro Tem Love, Councilmen Binder, Dryden

Noes: None

Mayor Pro Tem Love moved that the Council adopt a resolution authorizing payment to RAY OLSEN, Vice President of Koger Properties, Inc., the cost difference of 12"/8" water mains in Koger Executive Center, Units 1 and 2 - \$6,374.55. The motion, seconded by Councilman Lebermann, carried by the following vote:

Ayes: Councilmen Friedman, Handcox, Lebermann, Mayor Butler,
Mayor Pro Tem Love, Councilmen Binder, Dryden

Noes: None

ACQUISITION OF LAND FOR ST. JOHN'S NEIGHBORHOOD PARK

Mayor Pro Tem Love moved that the Council adopt a resolution authorizing the acquisition of 7404 Providence (Kuntz-Sternenberg Lumber Company) for the St. John's Neighborhood Park. The motion, seconded by Councilman Dryden, carried by the following vote:

Ayes: Councilmen Handcox, Lebermann, Mayor Butler, Mayor Pro Tem Love,
Councilmen Binder, Dryden, Friedman
Noes: None

ACQUISITION OF LAND FOR WEST 38TH STREET

Mayor Pro Tem Love moved that the Council adopt a resolution authorizing the acquisition of 1005 West 38th Street (H. Edward Padgett, Jr.) for widening West 38th Street. The motion, seconded by Councilman Dryden, carried by the following vote:

Ayes: Councilmen Handcox, Lebermann, Mayor Butler, Mayor Pro Tem Love,
Councilmen Binder, Dryden, Friedman
Noes: None

RENEWAL OF LEASE AGREEMENT

Mayor Pro Tem Love moved that the Council adopt a resolution authorizing renewal of a lease agreement with the Ladies Fire Auxiliary for the property at 5307 Balcones Drive. The motion, seconded by Councilman Dryden, carried by the following vote:

Ayes: Councilmen Handcox, Lebermann, Mayor Butler, Mayor Pro Tem Love,
Councilmen Binder, Dryden, Friedman
Noes: None

GRANT FOR MODEL CITIES FAMILY PLANNING PROJECT

Councilman Lebermann moved that the Council adopt a resolution authorizing the Health Department to accept a grant from the Department of Health, Education and Welfare for continuation of the Model Cities Family Planning Project. The contract will be from March 1, 1974 through February 28, 1975. (Total amount \$71,869.00 - 100% federal funds.) The motion, seconded by Councilman Handcox, carried by the following vote:

Ayes: Councilman Lebermann, Mayor Butler, Mayor Pro Tem Love,
Councilmen Binder, Dryden, Friedman, Handcox
Noes: None

GRANT AWARD FOR "SPECIALIZED COURSE OF INSTRUCTION IN
CONVERSATIONAL SPANISH FOR POLICE OFFICERS" PROJECT

Councilman Lebermann moved that the Council adopt a resolution authorizing the City Manager to accept a grant award from the Texas Criminal Justice Division for a "Specialized Course of Instruction in Conversational Spanish for Police Officers" project. Total project cost will be \$11,036: State - \$1,298; Federal - \$9,738; Local - 0. The motion, seconded by Councilman Handcox, carried by the following vote:

Ayes: Councilman Lebermann, Mayor Butler, Mayor Pro Tem Love,
Councilmen Binder, Dryden, Friedman, Handcox, Le
Noes: None

AUDIT OF COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT OFFICE OEO PROJECTS

Councilman Friedman moved that the Council adopt a resolution selecting Touche Ross & Company as the accounting firm to perform the annual audit of the Community Development Office OEO Projects for the activity year ending April 30, 1974. The motion, seconded by Mayor Pro Tem Love, carried by the following vote:

Ayes: Mayor Butler, Mayor Pro Tem Love, Councilmen Binder, Dryden,
Friedman, Handcox, Lebermann
Noes: None

DISPOSITION OF PROPERTY

Mayor Pro Tem Love moved that the Council adopt a resolution authorizing disposition of property as follows:

Accept negative bid - to be demolished only

1. August Heyer	2515 Santa Rita	\$ 50.00
2. August Heyer	1203 Cedar Avenue	\$135.00
3. Clarence Cullen Co.	7605 Providence	\$ 75.00
4. August Heyer	1127 Concho	\$ 50.00
5. Harold Pearson	6409 Porter	\$ 79.00

The motion, seconded by Councilman Dryden, carried by the following vote:

Ayes: Mayor Pro Tem Love, Councilmen Binder, Dryden, Friedman,
Handcox, Lebermann, Mayor Butler
Noes: None

ACTIONS ON SUBSTANDARD STRUCTURES

It was noted that various substandard structures, which had not been repaired or demolished within the required time, had been recommended by the Building Standards Commission that the Legal Department take proper legal disposition of them and were now before the Council for consideration. There were requests by Emil Roos and Lung Heirs of San Juanita for extensions; and Mr. Jerry Voss appeared on behalf of Mr. Kenneth Threadgill in reference to three various structures, requesting extensions.

Mayor Pro Tem Love moved that the Council accept the recommendations from the Building Standards Commission that the Legal Department take proper legal disposition of the following:

1. 902 Concho Street	Patricia Ann Simms Ehrlich
2. 2803 (A & B) Crest Avenue	Thomas E. Ates
3. 100 Red River Street	F. Lee Weigl
4. 1210 Redwood Avenue	Lucinda Harris
5. 2307 South Third Street	Janet D. Shelton

and grant 90-day extensions on the following:

1. 1603 Gregory Street	Emil Roos
2. 6416 (Front) North Lamar	Kenneth Threadgill
3. 6416 (A) North Lamar	Kenneth Threadgill
4. 6416 (B) North Lamar	Kenneth Threadgill
5. 6410 Porter Street	Foe Lawrence
6. 2032 East First Street	Lung Heirs of San Juanita

The motion, seconded by Councilman Friedman, carried by the following vote:

Ayes: Councilmen Binder, Dryden, Friedman, Handcox, Lebermann,
Mayor Butler, Mayor Pro Tem Love
Noes: None

GUIDELINES FOR SPECIAL TASK FORCE

Councilman Lebermann moved that the Council adopt guidelines for the work of the Council-appointed Special Task Force on Municipal Participation in Subdivision Development Policies. The motion, seconded by Councilman Friedman, carried by the following vote:

Ayes: Councilmen Dryden, Friedman, Handcox, Lebermann, Mayor Butler,
Mayor Pro Tem Love, Councilman Binder
Noes: None

TERMINATION AGREEMENT

Councilman Lebermann moved that the Council adopt a resolution approving a termination agreement with Southwestern Bell Telephone Company for telephone service for the Municipal Annex. The motion, seconded by Councilman Friedman, carried by the following vote:

Ayes: Councilmen Friedman, Handcox, Lebermann, Mayor Butler,
Mayor Pro Tem Love, Councilmen Binder, Dryden
Noes: None

HEARING SET ON REVOCATION OF ST. JOHN'S
NEIGHBORHOOD DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM

Mayor Pro Tem Love moved that the Council set a public hearing at 1:00 p.m. on May 16, 1974, on the revocation of the St. John's Neighborhood Development Program. The motion, seconded by Councilman Friedman, carried by the following vote:

Ayes: Councilmen Handcox, Lebermann, Mayor Butler, Mayor Pro Tem Love,
Councilmen Binder, Dryden, Friedman
Noes: None

PROPOSAL FOR REVITALIZATION OF CONGRESS AVENUE

Ms. Jean Bringol, President of We Care Austin, a Women's Environmental Coalition, appeared before Council to present a proposal for the revitalization of Congress Avenue with the goal to make the downtown area exciting, vital, and an attractive place to shop, dine, conduct business, live, and enjoy. They thought this seemed appropriate because of the Bicentennial Celebration, the renaissance of Fifth and Sixth Streets, current energy crisis, and the national renewal of interests in downtown area. Their proposal included the following initial steps:

1. The beautification of Congress Avenue.
They recommended sidewalks at corners be extended, wherever possible trees planted, benches and planters installed, and ramps for handicapped be incorporated. They asked that Council allocate funds for the beautification in the 1974-75 Capital Improvements Program budget. In support of this beautification effort, they intended to establish a Congress Avenue Beautification Fund.
2. The restoration of the facades of noteworthy 19th Century buildings on the avenues by the owners.
In connection with the Bicentennial Celebration, they requested that Council actively encourage private restoration of these facades and award special Bicentennial historical medallions to those who effect significant restoration.
3. The promotion of public transportation services to the downtown area.

She noted that they had discussed this proposal with many of the downtown merchants, business leaders, and land owners and had received considerable encouragement from them.

The Council indicated that the organization had done a magnificent job and that this was a fine proposal. Councilman Lebermann moved that the Council accept the proposal and award the plan a favorable review and comment and send on for budgetary consideration to be made part of the Capital Improvements Program budget. The motion, seconded by Mayor Pro Tem Love, carried by the following vote:

Ayes: Councilman Lebermann, Mayor Butler, Mayor Pro Tem Love,
Councilmen Binder, Dryden, Friedman, Handcox
Noes: None

PARADE PERMIT

Mayor Pro Tem Love moved that the Council grant a parade permit by Mr. David L. Ferguson for Zoe Ministries (Texas Non-Profit Corporation - 501C) on April 12, 1974 from 9:00 a.m. to 3:30 p.m. beginning at IH-35 (15 people - 9:00 a.m.); south on IH-35 to 26th Street; 26th to Guadalupe; Guadalupe to 10th Street; (parade begins - 100 people at 2:00 p.m., County Court House Park) south on Guadalupe to 7th Street; east on 7th to Congress; north on Congress to the State Capitol (3:00 p.m.). The motion, seconded by Councilman Lebermann, carried by the following vote:

Ayes: Mayor Butler, Mayor Pro Tem Love, Councilmen Binder, Dryden,
Friedman, Handcox, Lebermann
Noes: None

USE OF FACILITIES FOR POLLING PLACES

Mayor Pro Tem Love moved that the Council approve a request by the Republican Party of Travis County for the use of the Austin Recreation Center during the Republican Primary Election to be held on May 4, 1974. The motion, seconded by Councilman Lebermann, carried by the following vote:

Ayes: Mayor Butler, Mayor Pro Tem Love, Councilmen Binder, Dryden,
Friedman, Handcox, Lebermann
Noes: None

Mayor Pro Tem Love moved that the Council approve a request by the Raza Unida Party for use of the following City facilities as polling places for the May 4, 1974, and June 1, 1974, Primary Election:

St. John's Neighborhood Center	Clarksville Neighborhood Center
Montopolis Neighborhood Center	Rosewood Neighborhood Center
East First Neighborhood Center	South Austin Neighborhood Center
North Rural Neighborhood Center	West Rural Neighborhood Center
South Rural Neighborhood Center	East Rural Neighborhood Center

The motion, seconded by Councilman Lebermann, carried by the following vote:

Ayes: Mayor Butler, Mayor Pro Tem Love, Councilmen Binder, Dryden,
Friedman, Handcox, Lebermann
Noes: None

Mayor Pro Tem Love moved that the Council approve a request by the Travis County Democratic Executive Committee for use of the following City facilities as polling places for the May 4, 1974, and June 1, 1974, Primary Election:

Doris Miller Auditorium	Communications Building
West Rural Community Center	Fire Station, 4101 Speedway
Fire Station, Reese Lane	Ullrich Water Treatment Plant
Austin Recreation Center	Pan American Center

The motion, seconded by Councilman Lebermann, carried by the following vote:

Ayes: Mayor Butler, Mayor Pro Tem Love, Councilmen Binder, Dryden,
Friedman, Handcox, Lebermann
Noes: None

REQUEST BY AUSTIN SKI CLUB

Mayor Pro Tem Love moved that the Council approve a request by Mr. Dick Williamson, Senior Vice-President of the Austin Ski Club, for permission to hold a ski tournament on Town Lake at Festival Beach on April 20 and 21, 1974. The motion, seconded by Councilman Lebermann, carried by the following vote:

Ayes: Mayor Butler, Mayor Pro Tem Love, Councilmen Binder, Dryden,
Friedman, Handcox, Lebermann
Noes: None

REQUEST BY SOUTH AUSTIN OPTIMIST CLUB

Mr. Travis C. Smith, representing South Austin Optimist Club, had requested to appear before Council in connection with their request on April 4, 1974, by the Club to be allowed to name their new little league field at Garrison Park after one of their very deserving past members. Mayor Pro Tem Love noted that the Club had done an outstanding job at the Park but noted that it had been the policy not to name City structures after living persons. He added that he had been in contact with Mr. Smith and recommended that the gentleman be honored at the Council meeting on April 18, 1974.

ZONING ORDINANCES

The Mayor introduced the following ordinance:

AN ORDINANCE ORDERING A CHANGE IN USE AND CHANGING THE USE MAPS ACCOMPANYING CHAPTER 45 OF THE CODE OF THE CITY OF AUSTIN OF 1967 AS FOLLOWS:
LOT A, SENTER DOWNS ADDITION, LOCALLY KNOWN AS 4313-4321 SOUTH FIRST STREET, FROM "A" RESIDENCE DISTRICT TO "GR" GENERAL RETAIL DISTRICT; SAID PROPERTY BEING LOCATED IN AUSTIN, TRAVIS COUNTY, TEXAS; SUSPENDING THE RULE REQUIRING THE READING OF ORDINANCES ON THREE SEPARATE DAYS; AND DECLARING AN EMERGENCY.
(Senter P. Downs, C14-73-116)

Councilman Lebermann moved the Council waive the requirement for three readings, declare an emergency and finally pass the ordinance effective immediately. The motion, seconded by Councilman Dryden, carried by the following vote:

Ayes: Mayor Pro Tem Love, Councilmen Binder, Dryden, Friedman, Handcox, Lebermann, Mayor Butler
Noes: None

The Mayor announced the ordinance had been finally passed.

Mayor Butler introduced the following ordinance:

AN ORDINANCE ORDERING A CHANGE IN USE AND HEIGHT AND AREA AND CHANGING THE USE AND HEIGHT AND AREA MAPS ACCOMPANYING CHAPTER 45 OF THE CODE OF THE CITY OF AUSTIN OF 1967 AS FOLLOWS:
LOT A, OF THE E. L. K. ADDITION, LOCALLY KNOWN AS 4711 WEIDEMAR LANE, FROM INTERIM "A" RESIDENCE, INTERIM FIRST HEIGHT AND AREA DISTRICT TO "D" INDUSTRIAL, FIRST HEIGHT AND AREA DISTRICT; SAID PROPERTY BEING LOCATED IN AUSTIN, TRAVIS COUNTY, TEXAS; SUSPENDING THE RULE REQUIRING THE READING OF ORDINANCES ON THREE SEPARATE DAYS; AND DECLARING AN EMERGENCY. (Earl L. and Lois Kanetzky, C14-74-010)

Councilman Lebermann moved the Council waive the requirement for three readings, declare an emergency and finally pass the ordinance effective immediately. The motion, seconded by Councilman Dryden, carried by the following vote:

Ayes: Mayor Pro Tem Love, Councilmen Binder, Dryden, Friedman, Handcox, Lebermann, Mayor Butler
Noes: None

The Mayor announced the ordinance had been finally passed.

Mayor Butler introduced the following ordinance:

AN ORDINANCE ORDERING A CHANGE IN USE AND HEIGHT AND AREA AND CHANGING THE USE AND HEIGHT AND AREA MAPS ACCOMPANYING CHAPTER 45 OF THE AUSTIN CITY CODE OF 1967 AS FOLLOWS:

TRACT 1: A 12.747 ACRE TRACT OF LAND, LOCALLY KNOWN AS 6015-6115 SOUTH FIRST STREET AND THE REAR OF 6015-6115 SOUTH FIRST STREET, FROM INTERIM "A" RESIDENCE, INTERIM FIRST HEIGHT AND AREA DISTRICT TO "A" RESIDENCE, FIRST HEIGHT AND AREA DISTRICT; AND,

TRACT 2: LOT 1, BLOCK "Y," SWEETBRIAR VILLAGE COMMERCIAL AREA, LOCALLY KNOWN AS 6115-6317 SOUTH FIRST STREET AND 500-622 EBERHART LANE, FROM INTERIM "A" RESIDENCE, INTERIM FIRST HEIGHT AND AREA DISTRICT TO "GR" GENERAL RETAIL, FIRST HEIGHT AND AREA DISTRICT;

SAID PROPERTY BEING LOCATED IN AUSTIN, TRAVIS COUNTY, TEXAS; SUSPENDING THE RULE REQUIRING THE READING OF ORDINANCES ON THREE SEPARATE DAYS; AND DECLARING AN EMERGENCY. (M. H. Flourney, C14-73-144)

Councilman Lebermann moved the Council waive the requirement for three readings, declare an emergency and finally pass the ordinance effective immediately. The motion, seconded by Councilman Dryden, carried by the following vote:

Ayes: Mayor Pro Tem Love, Councilmen Binder, Dryden, Friedman, Handcox, Lebermann, Mayor Butler

Noes: None

The Mayor announced the ordinance had been finally passed.

Mayor Butler introduced the following ordinance:

AN ORDINANCE ORDERING A CHANGE IN USE AND HEIGHT AND AREA AND CHANGING THE USE AND HEIGHT AND AREA MAPS ACCOMPANYING CHAPTER 45 OF THE AUSTIN CITY CODE OF 1967 AS FOLLOWS:

TRACT 1: LOT 1 OF TANNEHILL TWO, AND LOT 1 OF FLOYD REISSIG SUBDIVISION, FROM INTERIM "A" RESIDENCE, INTERIM FIRST HEIGHT AND AREA DISTRICT TO "GR" GENERAL RETAIL, FIRST HEIGHT AND AREA DISTRICT; AND,

TRACT 2: LOT 2 OF TANNEHILL TWO, FROM INTERIM "A" RESIDENCE, INTERIM FIRST HEIGHT AND AREA DISTRICT TO "A" RESIDENCE, FIRST HEIGHT AND AREA DISTRICT; ALL OF SAID PROPERTY BEING LOCATED AT THE NORTHWEST CORNER OF EAST 19TH STREET AND ED BLUESTEIN BOULEVARD; SAID PROPERTY BEING LOCATED IN AUSTIN, TRAVIS COUNTY, TEXAS; SUSPENDING THE RULE REQUIRING THE READING OF ORDINANCES ON THREE SEPARATE DAYS; AND DECLARING AN EMERGENCY. (F. J. Reissig, et al, C14-73-157)

Councilman Lebermann moved the Council waive the requirement for three readings, declare an emergency and finally pass the ordinance effective immediately. The motion, seconded by Councilman Dryden, carried by the following vote:

Ayes: Mayor Pro Tem Love, Councilmen Binder, Dryden, Friedman, Handcox, Lebermann, Mayor Butler

Noes: None

The Mayor announced the ordinance had been finally passed.

REFUND CONTRACTS

Mayor Butler brought up the following ordinance for its second reading:

AN ORDINANCE AUTHORIZING THE CITY MANAGER OR THE DEPUTY CITY MANAGER TO ENTER INTO A CERTAIN REFUND CONTRACT WITH CITY NATIONAL BANK, TRUSTEE. (Research Plaza Subdivision)

The ordinance was read the second time, and Councilman Handcox moved that the ordinance be passed to its third reading. The motion, seconded by Mayor Pro Tem Love, carried by the following vote:

Ayes: Councilmen Dryden, Handcox, Lebermann, Mayor Pro Tem Love
Noes: Councilmen Friedman, Binder
Abstain: Mayor Butler

Mayor Butler introduced the following ordinance:

AN ORDINANCE AUTHORIZING THE CITY MANAGER OR THE DEPUTY CITY MANAGER TO ENTER INTO CERTAIN REFUND CONTRACTS WITH SPICEWOOD DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION; KOGER PROPERTIES, INCORPORATED; AND R. GRAHAM WILSON; SUSPENDING THE RULE REQUIRING THE READING OF ORDINANCES ON THREE SEPARATE DAYS; AND DECLARING AN EMERGENCY. (Balcones Village, Section 2; Koger Executive Center, Units 1 and 2; Colorado East Subdivision)

Mayor Pro Tem Love moved the Council waive the requirement for three readings, declare an emergency and finally pass the ordinance effective immediately. The motion, seconded by Councilman Dryden, carried by the following vote:

Ayes: Councilman Lebermann, Mayor Butler, Mayor Pro Tem Love,
Councilmen Dryden, Handcox
Noes: Councilmen Binder, Friedman

The Mayor announced the ordinance had been finally passed.

CONSIDERATION OF GAS RATE ORDINANCE

Mr. Frank Denius, representing Southern Union Gas Company, reviewed the gas situation stating that in December Coastal States had estimated the price of gas to be 45.07¢ per mcf and the price turned out to be 58.97¢. He added that the January sales volume was \$1,845,234 mcf; and the bills rendered, based on the volume, netted a loss of \$213,360.27. He asked that Council consider the possibility of allowing Southern Union to recoup this \$213,360.27, which was not a mistake on their part. He stated that to date, in round figures, the additional cost of gas over and above the contract price as a result of the September 27 and December 7 order of the Railroad Commission was in the neighborhood of \$700,000; and they were still behind approximately \$500,000; and if they were to refund in accordance with the ordinance passed through its first reading on March 7, 1974, they would get further behind. He asked again that they be able to recoup the \$213,360, which would not be permitted by the ordinance under Option "C". In reply to Mayor Butler's question, Mr. Denius stated that this \$213,360 was not a result of any error on their part. In reply to Mayor Pro Tem Love's question as to the period of time they would

expect to recoup this \$213,360, Mr. Denius stated that it would probably avoid the refund of approximately \$200,000 and would just about "washout," with a \$6,000 or \$7,000 difference.

Mr. Don Butler, City Attorney, stated that there were three different possibilities:

1. Option A - Southern Union's request, which would allow a quick catch-up.
2. Option B - would allow a net out of the differences; and if there were an undercharge or overcharge, there would be an amortization period to either collect or refund, as the case might be.
3. Option C - would require a refund and that Southern Union "live" with its undercharges during the month of December.

He noted that the argument for Option "C" was that this was agreed to under the original contract. Mr. Denius noted that they differed on this. Councilman Friedman stated that when this had been discussed before, it was his opinion then, and it had not changed, that the contract did not call for this make-up, as unreasonable as it might seem.

Motion

Mayor Butler brought up the following ordinance for its second reading:

AN ORDINANCE AMENDING SECTION 3 OF ORDINANCE NO. 711014-E BY PROVIDING FOR CERTAIN ADJUSTMENTS TO THE RATES OF SOUTHERN UNION GAS COMPANY. (Option B)

Mayor Pro Tem Love moved that the ordinance with the amendment of Option "B" be passed through the second reading. Councilman Dryden seconded the motion.

Councilman Lebermann stated that he was opposed to some of the original requests of the gas company, but that it was not Council's intent to penalize them as long as it conformed to the spirit of the contract, which he understood would give them the opportunity to pass through gas rate increases at the City "gate." Councilman Friedman thought that the contract had to be upheld, and he did not see this as being part of the contract. Discussion of intent was held.

Substitute Motion

Councilman Binder moved as a substitute motion that Option "C" be passed through its second reading. Councilman Friedman seconded the substitute motion.

Roll call showed the following vote:

Ayes: Councilmen Binder, Friedman, Hancox

Noes: Councilmen Lebermann, Dryden, Mayor Butler, Mayor Pro Tem Love

The substitute motion failed to carry by a 3 to 4 vote.

Vote on Original Motion

Roll call on Mayor Pro Tem Love's motion, with Councilman Dryden's second, to pass Option "B" through its second reading, showed the following vote:

Ayes: Mayor Pro Tem Love, Councilmen Dryden, Lebermann, Mayor Butler
Noes: Councilmen Binder, Friedman, Hancox

The motion carried by a 4 to 3 vote.

PROPOSAL FOR ASSISTANCE OF THE HANDICAPPED

Councilman Binder indicated that at his request, the City Manager's office had completed a review of access and mobility problems of handicapped persons and senior citizens with respect to curb barriers. He suggested that Council consider the following:

1. Establishment of minimum ramp design standards for use in existing and future subdivisions, city projects, etc.
2. Modifications to the existing City Code to establish provision to serve handicapped needs along streets, within buildings, etc.
3. Provisions in the 1974-79 Capital Improvement Program for funds (recommended \$25,000 per year) to construct ramps along existing streets, playgrounds, etc.

In conclusion, he requested that the City Manager develop specifics and bring them back for Council's review and approval at the appropriate time.

PROPOSED BUILDING CODE AMENDMENTS

Mr. John Gallery, Vice-Chairman of the Energy Conservation Commission, noted that since the members had been appointed, they had addressed a number of aspects to reduce the consumption of electrical energy without creating a great discomfort or inconvenience to the people in the community. He added that one aspect concerned building codes and the aspect of insulation. They recommended two ordinances to amend the Building Code of Austin:

1. Would establish minimum insulation requirements for ceilings and walls in new construction only for all frame structures which are equipped with cooling or heating by mechanical means. He noted that the present building codes required no insulation in structures of this kind. This would not effect existing structures; however, they planned to undertake an information program to make people aware of advantages of voluntarily installing proper insulation.
2. Would set forth minimum insulation requirements for supply and return air ducts used for heating and cooling. This would specify materials acceptable and would establish standards for those materials.

He indicated that they had developed these ordinances through their Building Codes Committee and had consulted with a number of organizations in the community. He noted that they had been reviewed by the General Contractors Association, the Austin Association of Home Builders, the Mechanical Contractors Association, and others representing the air conditioning and insulation industry. He further added that they worked with Mr. Lonnie Davis, Building Official, and the Electric Department. He indicated that on March 20, 1974, they held a public meeting of their own to obtain citizens' comments and responses, and at that meeting the Commission voted unanimously to recommend these ordinances for Council's early consideration. They requested a public hearing be held on these at the earliest and most convenient date.

Councilman Friedman moved that the Council set a public hearing for April 18, 1974, at 1:00 p.m. to consider the two ordinances amending the Building Code of the City of Austin. The motion, seconded by Councilman Lebermann, carried by the following vote:

Ayes: Mayor Butler, Councilmen Binder, Dryden, Friedman, Handcox,
Lebermann

Noes: None

Not in Council Chamber when roll was called: Mayor Pro Tem Love


ADJOURNMENT

The Council adjourned at 6:30 p.m.

APPROVED


Mayor

ATTEST:


Acting City Clerk